



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/506,357	04/15/2005	Jason Brett Harrop	17480P029	1087

8791 7590 02/05/2008  
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY  
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/05/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/506,357	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HARROP ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Kyle R. Stork	<b>Art Unit</b> 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 90-154 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 90-154 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                            |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This non-final office action is in response to the Election filed 19 October 2007.
2. Claims 90-154 are pending. Claims 90, 94, 112, and 146 are independent claims.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

3. Claims 155-178 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 19 October 2007.

### ***Drawings***

4. The examiner has accepted the drawings filed 31 August 2004.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 90-98, 100-101, 103, 106, 112-116, 118-121, 123, 128-131, 136-140, 142-149, and 154 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulthard et al. (US 2002/0178290, filed 11 June 2001, hereafter Coulthard), and further in view of Holloway et al. (US 2003/0033193, filed 9 August 2001, hereafter Holloway).

As per independent claim 90, Coulthard discloses a document generation system including:

(i) a generation component for generating an XML source document by associating an initial XML document with one or more logic sources (Figure 4; paragraphs 0034-0037: Here, an intermediate XML source document (item 416) in generated from a database logic source(item 414)); and

(ii) an insertion component for inserting in the XML source document one or more assembly instructions for determining content of an instance document (Figure 4; paragraphs 0034-0037: Here, Java servlet assemblies are inserted into the intermediate XML document)

Coulthard fails to specifically disclose validation of data with respect to a predetermined DTD or schema. However, Halloway discloses validation of XML data with respect to a predetermined DTD or schema (paragraph 0026). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Halloway with Coulthard, since it would have allowed for a user to determine the validity of the generated document.

As per dependent claim 91, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 90, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard further discloses wherein the logic sources include information for use in conjunction with said one or more assembly instructions to determine content of the instance document (paragraphs 0034-0042: Here, the logic sources are used to generate the intermediate XML source document, which are modified by the insertion of the assemblies. These assemblies and logic sources cause the formation of the JavaServlet page for display).

As per dependent claim 92, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 91, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard further discloses wherein the logic sources are external to the XML source document (Figure 4, items 414 and 416: Here, the database storing the logic sources is an entity separate from the generated intermediate XML document).

As per dependent claim 93, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 90, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard discloses insertion of assemblies into an intermediate XML file in order to generate a

Servlet page (Figure 4; paragraphs 0034-0042). Halloway discloses a DTD or schema for validation of XML data (paragraph 0026). Coulthard fails to teach a DTD or schema, yet still defines assembly instructions. Therefore, Coulthard inherently discloses assembly instructions not defined within a predetermined DTD or schema.

As per independent claim 94, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 90. Claim 94 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 95, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 91. Claim 95 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 96, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 92. Claim 96 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 97, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 94, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard further discloses inserting one or more assembly instructions defining one or more conditions in one or more of said logic sources, and inserting one or more assembly instructions in said XML source document to associate said conditions with one or more portions of said XML source document (paragraph 0040: Here, the insertion of assembly instructions into the XML source document defines the I/O output conditions for displaying the Servlet page).

As per dependent claim 98, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 97, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard further discloses wherein said conditions include conditions for determining whether portions of said XML source document will be included in said instance document

(paragraphs 0033-0034: Here, a legacy application is converted for display via the world wide web. This includes converting the legacy application into an intermediate XML document. The creation of the intermediate XML document determines portions of the legacy display to be inserted into the XML document based upon whether the data is static or dynamic data).

As per dependent claim 100, Coulthard and Holloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 94, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard further discloses adding, to a logic source, one or more logic elements for determining content of an instance document (Figure 4, item 412: Here, the logic source database is created from a display partitioned into a plurality of record formats (item 410). Therefore, the available logic sources are based upon the partitioning of logic elements contained within a display).

As per dependent claim 101, Coulthard and Holloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 100, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard fails to specifically disclose one or more logic elements including interview data for defining one or more questions for a user of said document assembly system, and for constraining responses to said questions. However, Holloway discloses one or more logic elements including interview data for defining one or more questions for a user of said document assembly System, and for constraining responses to said questions (Figures 4-7: Here, a user interface is displayed to a user. This displayed interface contains a plurality of user questions, constrained by a list of displayed responses. These questions and responses constitute user interview data). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have added interview data to the combination of Coulthard and Holloway, thereby allowing for user interaction for the generation of a document.

As per dependent claim 103, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 93. Claim 103 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 106, Coulthard and Holloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 96, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard fails to specifically disclose wherein the inserted data includes a URI. However, the examiner takes official notice that it is notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that a URI may be included within inserted data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined inserting a URI with Coulthard, since it would have allowed a user to specify a reference to external data.

As per independent claim 112, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 90. Claim 112 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 113, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 93. Claim 113 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 114, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 92. Claim 114 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 115, Coulthard and Holloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 112, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard further discloses wherein each of said one or more logic sources includes one or more



conditions, and said step of generating includes evaluating at least one of said conditions to determine whether a corresponding portion of the XML source document is included in said instance document (paragraphs 0034-0042).

As per dependent claim 116, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 115, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard further discloses wherein one or more conditions include one or more conditions for determining whether portions of said XML source document are included in said instance document (paragraphs 0033-0034: Here, a legacy application is converted for display via the world wide web. This includes converting the legacy application into an intermediate XML document. The creation of the intermediate XML document determines portions of the legacy display to be inserted into the XML document based upon whether the data is static or dynamic data).

As per dependent claim 118, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 112, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Halloway discloses wherein one or more logic elements in said one or more logic sources include interview data, and said step of generating includes providing one or more questions to a user and receiving one or more responses to said questions on the basis of said interview data (Figures 4-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have added interview data to the combination of Coulthard and Halloway, thereby allowing for user interaction for the generation of a document.

As per dependent claim 119, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 118, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Halloway further discloses wherein the step of generating includes generating assembly data on the basis of the responses (Figures 4-7: Here, a user interface is displayed to a user. This displayed interface contains a plurality of user questions, constrained by a list of displayed responses. These questions and responses constitute user interview data). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have added interview data to the combination of Coulthard and Halloway, thereby allowing for user interaction for the generation of a document.

As per dependent claim 98, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 119, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard further discloses wherein the instance document is generated on the basis of said assembly data (paragraphs 0033-0034: Here, a legacy application is converted for display via the world wide web. This includes converting the legacy application into an intermediate XML document. The creation of the intermediate XML document determines portions of the legacy display to be inserted into the XML document based upon whether the data is static or dynamic data).

As per dependent claim 121, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 112, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard discloses wherein the step of generating includes accessing said one or more logic sources on the basis of said assembly instructions (paragraphs 0033-0042).

As per dependent claim 123, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 112, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard discloses wherein the step of generating includes including text from a logic source in said instance document (Figure 4, items 412-416: Here, text from a legacy application is extracted into object blocks stored in a logic source database. The extracted logic source data ultimately converted into a dynamic document).

As per dependent claim 128, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 112, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard fails to specifically disclose evaluating a variable associated with date, including data determined to have a first value, and omitting data determined to have a second value. However, the examiner takes official notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that popular programming constructions such as if-else statements and case statements allow for values to be evaluated and different actions, such as inclusion and exclusion, to be performed based upon these evaluated values. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined this well known programming technique with Coulthard, since it would have allowed a user perform different actions based upon the evaluated values.

As per dependent claim 129, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 128, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard fails to specifically disclose use of Boolean variables. However, the examiner takes official notice that the use of Boolean variables was notoriously well known in the art at

the time of the applicant's invention for providing a finite set of values for data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the use of Boolean variables with Coulthard, thereby allowing for inclusion to data in an instance document to be one of two accepted Boolean values, True or False.

As per dependent claim 130, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 128. Claim 130 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 131, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 106. Claim 131 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 136, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 112, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard further discloses wherein said one or more logic sources includes one or more logic elements (Figure 4, item 414).

As per dependent claim 137, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 136, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard further discloses resolving one or more variables of said one or more logic elements, and wherein said instance document is generated on the basis of the resolved variables (Figure 4, items 412-416: Here, the data contained within the database is resolved to generate the intermediate XML document).

As per dependent claim 138, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 137, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard

further discloses wherein the resolving includes accessing a database (Figure 4, item 414).

As per dependent claim 139, Coulthard and Holloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 137, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Holloway further discloses performing interviews with a user (Figures 4-7: Here, a user interface is displayed to a user. This displayed interface contains a plurality of user questions, constrained by a list of displayed responses. These questions and responses constitute user interview data). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have added interview data to the combination of Coulthard and Holloway, thereby allowing for user interaction for the generation of a document.

As per dependent claim 140, Coulthard and Holloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 137, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard further discloses wherein the resolving includes executing one or more functions associated with said one or more logic elements (Figure 4, item 414).

As per dependent claim 142, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 94. Claim 142 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 143, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 94. Claim 143 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 144, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 112. Claim 144 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 145, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 112. Claim 145 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 146, Coulthard discloses a generation component for generating an XML source document by associating an initial XML document with one or more logic sources (Figure 4; paragraphs 0034-0037: Here, an intermediate XML source document (item 416) is generated from a database logic source (item 414)). Coulthard fails to specifically disclose validation of data with respect to a predetermined DTD or schema. However, Halloway discloses validation of XML data with respect to a predetermined DTD or schema (paragraph 0026). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Halloway with Coulthard, since it would have allowed for a user to determine the validity of the generated document.

As per dependent claim 147, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 146, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard further discloses wherein said one or more logic sources are external to said at least one XML source document (Figure 4, item 414).

As per dependent claim 148, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 147, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard further discloses an insertion component for inserting in the XML source document one or more assembly instructions for determining content of an instance document (Figure 4; paragraphs 0034-0037: Here, Java servlet assemblies are inserted into the intermediate XML document).

As per dependent claim 149, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 93. Claim 149 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 154, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 146, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard further discloses an editor for editing XML source documents and XML logic source (paragraph 0046).

8. Claims 99 and 117 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulthard and Halloway and further in view of Rajaram (US 2005/0026603, filed 2 November 2001).

As per dependent claim 99, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 97, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard discloses wherein at least one of the one or more portions of the XML source document includes one or more XML nodes in the XML source document (Figure 4). Coulthard fails to specifically disclose conditional inclusion of nodes within the instance document. However, Rajaram discloses conditional inclusion of nodes within an instance document (paragraph 0085). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Rajaram with Coulthard, since it would have allowed for conditional inclusion of nodes within an instance document (Rajaram: paragraph 0085).

As per dependent claim 117, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 99. Claim 117 is similarly rejected.

9. Claim 102 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulthard and Holloway and further in view of Krishnaprasad et al. (US 2002/0078094, filed 6 September 2001, hereafter Krishnaprasad).

As per dependent claim 102, Coulthard and Holloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 94, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard fails to specifically disclose inserting one or more assembly instructions includes inserting an assembly instruction indicating where content external to said XMLsource document can be included in said instance document (paragraph 0103-0104: Here, an <Insert> tag specifies where to insert instructions). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Krishnaprasad with Coulthard, since it would have specified a location for insertion of data (Krishnaprasad: paragraphs 0103-0104).

10. Claims 104-105, 107-108, 122, 132-135, and 150-153 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulthard and Holloway and further in view of Balmin et al. (US 7028028, filed 17 May 2001, hereafter Balmin).

As per dependent claim 104, Coulthard and Holloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 94, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard fails to specifically disclose wherein the assembly instructions include XML processing instructions. However, Balmin discloses the assembly instructions being XML processing instructions (Figure 4; column 4, lines 23-42; column 10, lines 3-9: Here



XML data is stored in a database. This XML data is then used to generate an instance document using the assembled XML data). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Balmin with Coulthard, since it would have allowed a user to create a single format instance document.

As per dependent claim 105, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 94, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard fails to specifically disclose wherein the assembly instructions include application data that can be parsed as XML. However, Balmin discloses assembly instructions including application data that can be parsed as XML (Figure 4; column 4, lines 23-42; column 10, lines 3-9: Here XML data is stored in a database. This XML data is then used to generate an instance document using the assembled XML data). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Balmin with Coulthard, since it would have allowed a user to create a single format instance document.

As per dependent claim 107, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 94, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard fails to specifically disclose wherein the logic sources are represented in XML. However, Balmin discloses wherein the logic sources are represented in XML (Figure 4; column 4, lines 23-42; column 10, lines 3-9: Here, the XML data is stored in a database). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Balmin with Coulthard, since it would have

allowed a user to create an intermediate XML document from a common format database.

As per dependent claim 108, Coulthard, Halloway, and Balmin disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 107, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard fails to specifically disclose validation of XML documents. The examiner takes official notice that validation of XML documents was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for determining if a document complies with XML standards. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have validated the logic sources, thereby ensuring that validity of the XML documents.

As per dependent claim 122, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 112, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard discloses generating one or more XML documents (Figure 4, item 414). Coulthard fails to specifically disclose creation of documents from XML source data. However, Balmin discloses creation of documents from XML source data (Figure 4; column 4, lines 23-42; column 10, lines 3-9: Here XML data is stored in a database. This XML data is then used to generate an instance document using the assembled XML data). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Balmin with Coulthard, since it would have allowed a user to create a single format instance document.

As per dependent claim 132, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 104. Claim 132 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 133, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 105. Claim 133 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 134, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 107. Claim 134 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 135, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 108. Claim 135 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 150, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 107. Claim 150 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 151, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 108. Claim 151 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 152, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 146, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard fails to specifically disclose rendering an output document for display. However, Balmin discloses rendering an output document for display (Figure 4; column 4, lines 23-42; column 10, lines 3-9: Here XML data is stored in a database. This XML data is then used to generate an instance document using the assembled XML data). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Balmin with Coulthard, since it would have allowed a user to view the created document.

As per dependent claim 153, Coulthard, Halloway, and Balmin disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 152. Coulthard fails to specifically disclose wherein at least one output format includes HTML, PDF, and RTF. However, the examiner

takes official notice that HTML, PDF, and RTF were notoriously well known output formats used to display data in a platform independent format. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined HTML, PDF, and RTF with Coulthard, since it would have allowed for data to be displayed in a platform independent format.

11. Claims 109-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulthard and Halloway, and further in view of Kimura et al. (US 2003/0097283, filed 27 February 2002, hereafter Kimura).

As per dependent claim 109, Coulthard and Halloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 94, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard fails to specifically disclose including attributes of a party. However, Kimura discloses party information included in a data system (paragraphs 0047-0048). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Kimura with Coulthard, since it would have allowed a user to include reservation information into a source document.

As per dependent claims 110, Coulthard, Halloway, and Kimura disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 109, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kimura further discloses wherein the party attributes include one or more of gender and number (paragraphs 0047-0048). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Kimura with Coulthard,

since it would have allowed a user to include reservation information into a source document.

As per dependent claim 111, Coulthard and Holloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 94, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard fails to specifically disclose party data. However, Kimura discloses party information included in a data system (paragraphs 0047-0048). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Kimura with Coulthard, since it would have allowed a user to include reservation information into a source document.

As per dependent claim 124, Coulthard and Holloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 112. Coulthard fails to disclose user responses. However, Kimura discloses receiving user responses (paragraphs 0047-0048). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Kimura with Coulthard, since it would have allowed for customization of an instance document.

As per dependent claim 125, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 109 and 110. Claim 125 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 126, Coulthard and Holloway disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 112, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Coulthard fails to specifically disclose including an item one or more times. However, Kimura discloses including an item one or more times (paragraphs 0047-0048: Here, party information, such as reservation date, type, and start time are included at least once in

each reservation). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Kimura with Coulthard, since it would have allowed a user to include required information within an instance document.

As per dependent claim 127, Coulthard, Halloway, and Kimura disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 126, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kimura further discloses wherein the item has a different value for each of the times (paragraphs 0047-0048). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Kimura with Coulthard, since it would have allowed a user to include required information within an instance document.

As per dependent claim 141, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 111. Claim 141 is similarly rejected.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:  
10/506,357  
Art Unit: 2178

Page 22

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2178

krS

  
STEPHEN HONG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER